

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Appl. No. : 10/717,671
Applicant : Anuj DUA, et al.
Filed : November 21, 2003
Title : A METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR FETCHING
INSTRUCTIONS FROM THE MEMORY SUBSYSTEM OF A
MIXED ARCHITECTURE PROCESSOR INTO A HARDWARE
EMULATION ENGINE
TC/A.U. : 2183
Examiner : Huisman, David J.
Docket No. : 10001618-3
Customer No. : 022879

Mail Stop Issue Fee
Commissioner of Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

COMMENT ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

Sir:

This Comment On Statement Of Reasons For Allowance is filed in reply to the November 16, 2007 Notice of Allowability. Applicants respectfully object to the Examiner's statement.

The inventions are defined by the claims, *i.e.*, by each claim taken as a whole. The prior art does not disclose, suggest, or make obvious the claimed inventions. Applicants respectfully object to the statements by the Examiner characterizing the claimed inventions.

With respect to claims 1, 7, and 11, the Examiner's Statement Of Reasons For Allowance states:

Regarding claims 1 and 7, the prior art of record has failed to teach, both individually and in combination, and together with all additional claimed features, receiving, at the pipeline advance logic, a delayed version of the fetch complete signal, and advancing the fetch address through the fetch engine and the emulation engine based on the delayed version of the fetch complete signal.

Appl. No. 10/717,671

Comment dated January 16, 2008

Reply to Notice of Allowability of November 16, 2007

Regarding claim 11, the prior art of record has failed to teach, both individually and in combination, and together with all additional claimed features, pipeline advance logic, wherein the pipeline advance logic receives a delayed version of the fetch complete signal and advances the fetch address through the fetch engine and the engine of the emulated ISA based on the delayed version of the fetch complete signal.


The above statements do not accurately reflect the inventions as recited in claims 1, 7, and 11. Furthermore, the above statement is merely a paraphrase of a portion of one of the allowed claims.

Applicants respectfully object to this statement and assert that the cited prior art, considered as a whole, fails to teach or suggest each and every element of the invention that is recited in each claim. Thus, the claims are allowable over the cited prior art.

Applicants respectfully request that the above comments be placed in the file and made of record.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 16, 2008


John Harrop
Registration No. 41,817
Andrews Kurth LLP
1350 I Street, N.W.
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Tel. (202) 662-3050
Fax (202) 662-2739